

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-18, 20-23, 29, 31, 46-50, and 59 will be pending. By this amendment: claim 8 has been canceled; claims 1, 18, 29, and 46 have been amended; and claim 59 has been added. No new matter has been added.

**Claim Objections to claim 8**

In Section 2 (on page 2) of the office action dated September 7, 2011 (“the Office Action”), claim 8 stands objected to.

Claim 8 has been canceled. Features recited in claim 8 have been incorporated into new claim 59.

**§103 Rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 18, 20-23, 29, 31, 46, and 47**

In Section 4 (on page 2) of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 13, 18, 20-23, 29, 31, 46, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,534; hereinafter referred to as “Geiger”) in view of Alve et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0076955; hereinafter referred to as “Alve”).

Regarding amended claim 1, it now recites:

A method of adding a client as a member of a hub network which includes a plurality of devices, comprising:

- (a) detecting a client newly connected to the hub network by a server, wherein the server periodically polls the plurality of devices for the client;
- (b) authenticating the client to determine an identity of the client;

- (c) authorizing the client to determine that the client is a compliant device that operates according to rules defined for the hub network,
- (d) wherein the compliant device enables a user to present, move, and copy content data to be controlled to reflect guidelines of licenses of the content data set for a licensing authority, and
- (e) wherein the client sends a message to the plurality of devices on the hub network indicating that the client is now connected to the hub network;
- (f) adding the client as a member in the hub network when it is determined that the client has been detected, authenticated, authorized, and is in a local environment of the server; and
- (g) providing licenses for the content data bound to the hub network to members of the hub network,
- (h) wherein a source version of the content data is stored on the server, and copies of the source versions are stored on the compliant device as sub-copy versions.

(emphasis / limitation designations added)

In addition to the arguments presented in responses to previous office actions (which are maintained here), following additional arguments are presented.

Regarding amended limitation (a), it recites “detecting a client newly connected to the hub network by a server, wherein the server periodically polls the plurality of devices for the client.” This limitation is disclosed in at least Paragraph [0078] (of the Publication of the present application – Pub. No. 2004/0117484) as follows (emphasis added):

[0078] The server detects the connected client device, block 1810. A compliant device sends a message or connection notification to devices on the hub network

indicating that the device is now connected to the hub network. In another implementation, the server periodically polls connected devices for new clients.

In addressing limitation (a) of claim 1 (prior to the amendment), the Office Action cites to the same passages in the same prior art reference as in the prior office action (i.e., Geiger, column 10, lines 8-54) without specifically addressing the applicants' arguments presented in the response to the prior office action. These passages of Geiger are recited here for reference:

[Col. 10, lines 8-54] A "domain", or "security domain", is a public key infrastructure under the control of a single authority and using a defined internal naming scheme, algorithms, and policies. Domain authority flows for a domain root certification authority having a globally unique name. This allows domains to generate agreements and hook together forming a global PKI. An entity that has been enrolled in a domain by the certifying of the public key that the entity owns within the domain is a "domain member". The following are the possible WAP domains, some or all of which will be referred to: manufacturer(s); network; operator(s); wireless service provider(s); content/services providers (e.g., banking domain); trusted third party domains (e.g., an independent certification agent or authority); device owner (fleet operator domain); and device user (personal domain).

An "attribute" is either a characteristic (which can be considered to be a name) or a right (i.e. a permission, for example a permission to access a purchased service). Examples of attributes, are owned objects (e.g. directories & files, hardware and & interfaces) and owned rights/permissions (e.g. make call; establish network connection; send SMS message; read/write/update files & directories; configure device hardware; access network management station.

In order to implement this security infrastructure, the WAP Public Key system 10 enrolls and authenticates WAP domain members and distribute attributes. Note that the

word "distribute" includes "distribute to purchaser"; i.e., subscribers may be purchasing attributes such as access to content or services.

The WAP PKI architecture consists of autonomous security domains tied together by cross-certification. Such cross-certification is a part of service roaming agreements between service providers and system operators. Cross certification is the process by which two domain root CA's issue one another cross-certificates; thereby authorizing one another's root certificates (keys). Cross-certificates generally contain the address of one or more inter-domain validation servers and may also contain other information related to the cross-certification agreements. For the wireless industry cross-certification can be similar to creation of roaming agreements. Within a security domain the algorithms, naming scheme, and policies of that domain are determined by the owner of the domain. During the cross-certification procedure, domains agree on interoperability issues and configure validation servers to allow certificate validation to be performed.

Although the applicants do not agree with the Examiner that these passages disclose limitation (a) before the amendment, the applicants nevertheless further amended this limitation to move the prosecution along to allowance. Accordingly, the applicants submit that the cited passages of Geiger fail to teach or suggest amended limitation (a). Specifically, Geiger fails to teach or suggest a server which periodically polls the plurality of devices for the client connected to a hub network.

Regarding newly-added limitation (e) of claim 1, it recites that "wherein the client sends a message to the plurality of devices on the hub network indicating that the client is now connected to the hub network". None of the cited passages disclose this limitation.

As explained in the Manual of Patent Examination Procedure §706.02, entitled Rejection on Prior Art, for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, "to support the conclusion

that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” As set forth in detail above, the outstanding rejections are improper because the cited references do not suggest the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly, or the examiner did not present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the cited references.

Accordingly, claim 1 should be allowable over the combination of Geiger and Alve. Regarding independent claims 18, 29, and 46, similar arguments as those of claim 1 apply to these claims. Therefore, claims 18, 29, and 46 should also be allowable over the combination of Geiger and Alve. Since claims 3-5, 13, 20-23, 31, and 47 depend from one of base claims 1, 18, 29, and 46, and include all of the limitations of the base claims, claims 3-5, 13, 20-23, 31, and 47 should also be allowable over the combination of Geiger and Alve.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 13, 18, 20-23, 29, 31, 46, and 47 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claim 7

In Section 1 (on page 10) of the Office Action, claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger and Alve, and further in view of Kamperman (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0273608).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1, and since dependent claims inherit the patentability of the corresponding independent claims, claim 7 should be allowable over the combination of Geiger and Alve.

Further, the arguments presented in responses to previous office actions regarding claim 7 are maintained here.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 7 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 9, 10, 48, and 49

In Section 3 (on page 10) of the Office Action, claims 9, 10, 48, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger and Alve, as applied to claims 1 and 46, and further in view of Fransdonk (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0167392).

Since claims 9, 10, 48, and 49 depend from one of base claims 1 and 46, and include all of the limitations of the base claims, claims 9, 10, 48, and 49 should also be allowable over the combination of Geiger and Alve. Further, Fransdonk does not disclose any further limitations disclosed in the base claims. Therefore, claims 9, 10, 48,

and 49 should be allowable over the combination of Geiger, Alve, and Fransdonk.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 9, 10, 48, and 49 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

#### §103 Rejection of Claims 11 and 50

In Section 8 (on page 13) of the Office Action, claims 11 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger, Alve, and Fransdonk, and further in view of Uhlik (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0112948).

Since claims 11 and 50 depend from one of base claims 1 and 46, and include all of the limitations of the base claims, claims 11 and 50 should also be allowable over Geiger, Alve, and Fransdonk. Further, Uhlik does not disclose any further limitations disclosed in the base claims. Therefore, claims 11 and 50 should be allowable over the combination of Geiger, Alve, Fransdonk, and Uhlik.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 11 and 50 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

#### §103(a) Rejection of Claim 12

In Section 11 (on page 14) of the Office Action, claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger, Alve, and Uhlik.

Since claim 12 depends from base claim 1, and includes all of the limitations of

the base claim, claim 12 should also be allowable over Geiger, Alve, and Uhlik.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 12 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103(a) Rejection of Claims 8 and 14-17

In Section 13 (on page 15) of the Office Action, claims 8 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger and Alve, as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Abburi et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,203,966; hereinafter referred to as “Abburi”).

Since claims 8 and 14-17 depend from base claim 1, and include all of the limitations of the base claim, claims 8 and 14-17 should also be allowable over Geiger and Alve. Further, Abburi does not disclose any further limitations disclosed in the base claim. Therefore, claims 8 and 14-17 should be allowable over the combination of Geiger, Alve, and Abburi.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 8 and 14-17 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-18, 20-23, 29, 31, 46-50, and 59 in view of the remarks and submit that all pending claims are presently in condition for allowance.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 6, 2012

By: /Samuel S. Lee/  
Samuel S. Lee  
Reg. No. 42,791

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP  
525 B Street, Suite 2200  
San Diego, California 92101-4469  
(619) 525-3821